

FIRST_COLUMBIA_SUBDIVISION_(07-200)

MR. ARGENIO: This application is simple, it's a simple minor non-residential subdivision at the existing New York International Plaza property. I see Mr. Bette is here to represent this. Chris, what do you have for us?

MR. BETTE: Yes, my name is Chris Bette with First Columbia, I haven't been here in quite some time so it's nice to be back. Mr. Chairman, if we could, I'm on the agenda for two items, subdivision and site plan, I'd like to do one presentation if that would be okay with you?

MR. ARGENIO: Yeah, I don't think that would be a bad idea. I want to see the site plan, I want to see how involved it is.

MR. EDSALL: Can we make sure, I don't have a problem with it being one presentation but so the record stays clear we should make our applications separate.

MR. ARGENIO: Yeah.

MR. BETTE: This is the first time we're seeing this particular project in this fashion, we have been here I think quite a while ago, we were here maybe on an informational basis for 100,000 square foot building. Tonight we're here for a 60,000 square foot building. So we have down-sized it a little bit. Just to get started, so you don't need a magnifying glass, I'll quickly orientate everybody, on the subdivision map Route 207 is to the left side of the sheet, we're going to be along Hudson Valley Avenue, the site is actually off Avenue of the Americas, just so you know where the site is, it's the corner just north of 555 Hudson Valley Avenue that we built a year or so ago and across the street from the Litron facility so just kind of working our way up Hudson Valley Avenue so far with our

development. We're proposing a 3 1/2 story 60,000 square foot general medical office building, we have not secured any tenants to date, we're just getting something in a shovel ready fashion so that when we do we're quick towards construction. So 3 1/2 stories, the south elevation will be a fourth story elevation and the north elevation of the building will be a three story elevation.

MR. ARGENIO: Because that hill has that slope?

MR. BETTE: Because there's a slope across the whole parcel. There's a good slope across the whole parcel and doing the half story construction allows us to have two access points at two different floors which actually is a nice feature. The negative is that we end up with a little bit of a basement wall for the first floor. Two access points both off of that Avenue of the Americas, we elected to come off Avenue of the Americas due to the proximity of the front parking lot to the intersection of Hudson Valley Avenue and Avenue of the Americas and also due to the grade change from the proposed Hudson Valley Avenue connection that we're hoping to do shortly. There's quite a bit of grade change between that parking lot and that road so we have chosen to come off Avenue of the Americas at two different points to service the building. Utilities are provided from, water service will be provided from Hudson Valley Avenue from the 12 inch main that we installed in 2000 and runs to the front of the building and then we have incorporated a hydrant and I'm meeting with the fire prevention office on the north east side of the building. Sanitary sewer will be conveyed to Avenue of the Americas into the municipal system and storm water's going to be managed on site. We have grade across the whole site, we're planning a detention facility that's compliant with the Phase 2 regulations on the eastern side of the parcel, if you remember, Mr. Chairman, you're probably one of the few that were here when we went through our EIS we had designed and

through the EIS regional basins as opposed to individual site basins. We have been doing individual site basins on a temporary basis. You will notice with the last approval with 555 Hudson Valley Avenue with anticipation of building a new regional basin further on the south east corner of the parcel that will eliminate the need for both of those temporary basins so we're proposing temporary basins for now with the intention to locate them further to the east and the south when we develop that parcel below it.

MR. ARGENIO: Why do you want to do that? Why does that make sense from a developer's point of view? Why would we as a Town want more basins?

MR. BETTE: Well, we're not, we're actually going to have less of them, instead of a basin for each facility that we would need to meet today's regulations.

MR. ARGENIO: I understand.

MR. BETTE: We're going to have just larger regional basins throughout the site.

MR. ARGENIO: Okay, I'm with you.

MR. BETTE: So that's the way we looked at it two years ago, three years ago when we went through the impact statement. It's pretty cut and dry, very similar to what we have done in the past and looking to continue with it and again looking to get it to a point where we can be quick to react if a tenant of, you know, fairly decent size knocks on our door to start construction.

MR. ARGENIO: Well, let's talk about the subdivision first, I want to read, Mark, I'm going to read your comment number 2. Planning board has already completed SEQRA review for the overall New York International Plaza development, we need to confirm consistency with this application, once this is done, no further SEQRA

action is required. What we say is we need to confirm consistency, what does that mean, Mark?

MR. EDSALL: We've done it already and Dom and I we're just discussing that we have on previous applications and not just the First Columbia applications but the applications involving RPA where there was a previous EIS completed, the board has the ability to make an evaluation as to whether the current action is consistent with the findings of the EIS, you have done that for RPA and in fact with RPA because there was a significant amount of time between the initial EIS and the findings to which we're having a new action in front of you, you have actually asked for additional information and in fact supplemental on their particular application. Here it's very fresh and really what we need to do is catalogue.

MR. ARGENIO: Old RPA that's 12 years old.

MR. EDSALL: Very old, that's why the board made a decision to ask for a supplemental here, it's very fresh, we've got new information, what Dom and I were just discussing is creating a good record by not just having the board reach a determination in the minutes but actually creating a resolution that acknowledges the specific state where you're at relative to the thresholds that were in the EIS to why they're with all previous applications plus this application.

MR. CORDISCO: This application, this particular one that's before the board right now is contemplated in the full Environmental Impact Statement and then it was addressed and so what you need to do since SEQRA's closed and you have a findings statement that concluded the SEQRA process, you now are basically comparing this that that completed SEQRA process becomes the yardstick and so you compare this application against that yardstick. If it falls under the yard stick within all thresholds set forth, there's no need unless something

is changed, some new information has come about but there's no need to create any further SEQRA review.

MR. ARGENIO: We're so early in the process of this.

MR. EDSALL: It is at this point I don't mean it sarcastically a joke because there's so much development contemplated and we're so early in the development of this park in your wildest dreams there's no way we can ever be over one of the thresholds but we're talking about starting to keep the record clear, Chris offered several months ago to sit down and start to create a spreadsheet and catalogue the applications.

MR. BETTE: We have included that with this application.

MR. EDSALL: Yes, but what we want to do is take the next step and have a consistency resolution, include that information.

MR. CORDISCO: One of your options would be just to determine, you know, as part of the minutes that SEQRA's concluded, but I think we better for in the future as more applications come in that you have a written document that you can then compare future applications against.

MR. ARGENIO: You're going to keep that tabulation, Mark?

MR. EDSALL: Between Chris, myself and Dom what we're going to do start is just making the record that much more complete.

MR. ARGENIO: Do we need to have a motion and vote, Dominic, over the consistency in this?

MR. CORDISCO: Yes, you do, and you also need to have a motion as to whether or not a public hearing is going

to be required and we're talking about once again we're talking about two separate applications here, one is the minor subdivision and the second one is for site plan approval.

MR. ARGENIO: Only talking about the subdivision now we'll talk about the, Chris made his pitch, that's fine, but we're talking about the subdivision right now.

MR. CORDISCO: I just wanted the record to be clear.

MR. EDSALL: My suggestion is, Mr. Chairman, is that you since this we could roll both the subdivision and the site plan into one consistency resolution, I'd suggest you authorize Dom to prepare that, we'll get that into the record and subsequently--

MR. ARGENIO: You're assuming that everybody agrees.

MR. EDSALL: I can't imagine that they're even close to a threshold.

MR. ARGENIO: I will go around the room informally, Dan, do you agree with that?

MR. GALLAGHER: Yes.

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MR. MINUTA: Yes, we're nowhere near the threshold so sure.

MR. ARGENIO: So you're authorized to prepare that document, Dominic. As far as public hearing goes, correct me if I'm wrong, if we had a public hearing on this we would send the letters to the Town of New Windsor?

MR. EDSALL: Yes, kind of foolish.

MR. ARGENIO: What's the purpose of even discussing the public hearing?

MR. EDSALL: Just to get it on the record, if you decide you don't want one.

MS. MASON: It would go in the paper as well.

MR. CORDISCO: Yes.

MR. EDSALL: Again, nothing that's before the board is something other than what was contemplated in the EIS for which you had a public hearing.

MR. ARGENIO: Yeah, I think that by virtue of the fact that the only neighbor here is the Town of New Windsor and if I remember correctly for the other buildings we didn't have a public hearing either, did we, Mark?

MR. EDSALL: No, I believe what your determination was is that it was reviewed exhaustively as part of the SEQRA EIS and there was no real need to have another public hearing.

MR. ARGENIO: And the only neighbors are ourselves. Does anybody disagree with that?

MR. GALLAGHER: No.

MR. MINUTA: I can't see any reason not to, I mean to have one.

MR. ARGENIO: Do we need to waive that, Dominic?

MR. CORDISCO: Yes, you need to have a vote to waive the public hearing.

MR. ARGENIO: Can I have a motion to waive the public hearing for the subdivision?

MR. GALLAGHER: So moved.

MR. BROWN: Second it.

MR. R. ARGENIO: Motion has been made and seconded that the Town of New Windsor Planning Board waive the public hearing for the New York International Plaza minor subdivision. Any further discussion? Roll call.

ROLL CALL

MR. GALLAGHER	AYE
MR. BROWN	AYE
MR. MINUTA	AYE
MR. ARGENIO	AYE

MR. ARGENIO: We determined consistency, we talked about the public hearing, Mark, on this or I should say Mark and Dominic, certainly the site plan will receive I don't want to say exhaustive review but because that's not very nice but it will receive quite a substantial review, anything to prevent us from proceeding? How far can we go with the subdivision tonight?

MR. EDSALL: You could approve it.

MR. CORDISCO: You could authorize, I think the best thing to do would be to have written resolutions for approval and you could authorize those, I will prepare them hand in hand with the SEQRA determination of consistency.

MR. ARGENIO: I don't want to be accused of moving too fast. Do you take exception to that?

MR. MINUTA: I don't, I just have a question.

MR. ARGENIO: We're not voting on it, just authorize

Dominic to prepare the resolutions.

MR. MINUTA: Okay, that's fine.

MR. ARGENIO: Certainly by all means ask your question.

MR. MINUTA: I just have two questions. One is with regard to the subdivision, I'm making the assumption that these are well within the thresholds of zoning compliance as far as setbacks, areas, et cetera, yes?

MR. EDSALL: Yes, there's bulk tables on the plans, everything's fine.

MR. MINUTA: You mentioned something about the detention basins, smaller ones versus larger ones and sort of diverting to a larger one being the preferred, correct?

MR. BETTE: Correct.

MR. MINUTA: Is there an efficiency or inefficiency based on having a smaller versus several smaller versus one larger?

MR. BETTE: No, should be no difference. The larger basin will still have to comply with the New York State DEC storm water regulations, it's just going to be a little bigger in nature, we just won't have 30 of them scattered around, we'll have one in one corner, I think we had three planned, three or four planned in the EIS.

MR. MINUTA: I would imagine they're a lot easier to maintain.

MR. BETTE: Right, there's maintenance requirements today with the thing so it would be a lot easier to maintain three or four as opposed to 20.

MR. ARGENIO: Dominic, you have been authorized to

February 28, 2007

58

prepare that, please do so.